



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/501,082	07/09/2004	Yasushi Katayama	254519US6PCT	3119
22850 7590 11/09/2007 OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			EXAMINER MUSA, ABDELNABI O	
			ART UNIT 2146	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 11/09/2007	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patentdocket@oblon.com  
oblonpat@oblon.com  
jgardner@oblon.com

## Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/501,082

Applicant(s)

KATAYAMA, YASUSHI

Examiner

Abdelnabi O. Musa

Art Unit

2146

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 09 July 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - 3) ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

Acknowledgment is made for the applicant's response and amendment filed on 09/12/2007.

### Claims

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

1. Claim(s) 1, 5, 9, 13, 17 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jeyachandran et al. Patent No.: (US 6,567,176 B1) and further in view of Ito et al. (US 6,085,019)

Jeyachandran et al. teaches all of the claimed limitations and further teaches an information processing apparatus to process a request to a plurality of nodes connected to a network (Col. 1, Line 11; Col. 2, Line 48) and further teaches the node receiving the request and determines if it should process it whereas the detection means detect the presents of available information in the setting unit that sets information to allow a determination to execute the request accordingly in any of the plurality of nodes connected to the network (Col. 3, Line 62; Col. 5, Line 41) also teaches a setup means

Art Unit: 2146

for setting up the information according to the device setting parameters (Col. 1, Line 30; Col. 3, Line 12; Col. 10, Line 16) and teaches a response unit that plays a rule deciding condition operation where it determines whether or not a response should be made (Col. 38, Line 14; Col. 39, line 8; FIG. 5, 14, 45) and further teaches an interface unit for data transmissions and a packet generating unit that generating unit that generates and stores data to be processed by the response unit (Col. 31, Line 24; FIG. 51) However, Jeyachandran et al. does not teach recording and reproducing data to and from a record medium operate to communicate with plural devices connected to a network. Ito et al teaches the recording and reproducing apparatus includes plural devices connected to a network wherein each input and output device is operable to receive a recording or reproducing request signal (Col. 1, Line 6; Col. Col. 3, Line 53)

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was mad to have modified Jeyachandran et al. by the teaching of Ito et al. because processing information requests from a node requires storing recording the request to a storage medium then reproducing the information according to the time set forth to be processed. One must store such request in a node and produce the information according to the request job assigned for it.

### **Claims**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) The invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claim(s) 1,3, 5, 7, 9 -13, 15, 17, 19, 21-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Miyoshi et al. Pub. No. (US. 2003/0179861 A1).

As per claim 1, Miyoshi et al. teaches an information processing apparatus as a recording command apparatus (recording command operating unit, [0027]) for transmitting a data recording processing request (recording unit request command [0029]) to a plurality of nodes connected to a network (connected to network to carry out communication [0006]), comprising:

a rule deciding condition setting unit (judgment unit to control changeover data [0051]) configuring to set data to allow a determination of (predetermined compression processing [0033] ) whether processing according to the processing request is to be executed (processing executed, FIG.5 [0046]) in any node of the plurality of nodes that receives the data recording processing request (data recording unit [0032]);

a packet generating unit (data generating unit [0052]) configured to store the data (temporarily data sorting [0054] ) set by the rule deciding condition setting unit (judgment unit to control changeover data [0051]), and configured to generate a data

Art Unit: 2146

recording processing request packet (data generating unit [0048]) that includes the data (data stored data recording [0050]) for recording processing (See FIG. 5); and

a network interface unit (network interface unit [0024]) configured to transmit the packets generated (data generating unit [0052]) by the packet generating unit to each node in the plurality of nodes (See FIG. 5).

As per claim 3, Miyoshi et al. teaches the information processing apparatus according to claim 1 (recording command operating unit, [0027]), further comprising:

a data processing unit (a control and timer processing unit for carrying out code executing [0022]) configured to execute FEC encoding processing and interleave processing of data for recording processing (See Abstract, FIG. 5); wherein

said packet generating unit (data generating unit [0052]) is configured to generate a packet (processing executed, FIG.5 [0046]) in which data processed by the data processing unit is set as a payload (payload for data size indication, respective FIGs [0072]).

As per claim 5, Miyoshi et al. teaches an information processing apparatus as a reproducing command apparatus (reproducing command operating unit, [0027]) for transmitting a data reproducing processing request (reproducing unit request command [0029] to a plurality of nodes connected to a network (connected to network to carry out communication [0006]), comprising:

a rule deciding condition setting unit (judgment unit to control changeover data [0051]) configured to set data to allow a determination of (predetermined compression processing [0033] ) whether processing according to the processing request is to be executed (processing executed, FIG.5 [0046]) in any node of the plurality of nodes that receives the data reproducing processing request (data reproducing unit [0032]);

a packet generating unit (data generating unit [0052] ) configured to store the data (temporarily data sorting [0054] ) set by the rule deciding condition setting unit (judgment unit to control changeover data [0051]), and configured to generate a data reproducing processing request packet (data generating unit [0048]) that includes the data for reproducing processing (data stored data reproducing [0050], FIG..5); and

a network interface unit (network interface unit [0024]) configured to transmit the packets generated by the packet generating unit to each node in the plurality of nodes (data generating unit [0052]).

As per claim 7, Miyoshi et al. teaches the information processing apparatus according to claim 5 (recording command operating unit, [0027]), further comprising:

a data recovery processing unit (data storage and buffer units to recover data [0048]) configured to execute de-interleave processing and FEC decoding processing (code transactions and synchronization [0086]), wherein;

said data recovery processing unit configured to execute the de-interleave processing and the FEC decoding processing for reproducing processing (a control and timer processing unit for carrying out code executing [0022]) data extracted from a

Art Unit: 2146

packet received from a node that receives the data reproducing processing request (reproducing processing request that start commands to record and reproduce [0029]), and recovers the data (data reproducing unit [0032]).

As per claim 9, Miyoshi et al. teaches an information processing apparatus comprising:

- a data reception unit (data reception and transmission between units [0037]);
- a rule decision processing unit (judgment unit to control changeover data [0051]) configured to determine whether data processing based on a data processing request received via the data reception unit is to be executed (reproducing processing request that start commands to record and reproduce [0029]); and
- a data processing unit configured to execute data processing based on the determination of the rule decision processing unit, wherein

the rule decision processing unit is configured to execute determination processing for determining whether or not the processing according to the processing request( See FIG. 2) is to be executed based on data for determination (predetermined operation is carried out in the message for user assistance [0050]) included in the data processing request received via the data reception unit (reception of device I/O control [0022]).



As per claim 10, Miyoshi et al. teaches the information processing apparatus according to claim 9 (data reception and transmission between units [0037], and a judgment unit to control changeover data [0051]), wherein:

said data for determination is a probability value as a rule deciding condition descriptor included in a data processing request (request packet or code line for description and designation of computers [0077], [0081], [0082]); and

said rule decision processing unit is configured to determine whether or not the processing according to a processing request (See FIG. 2) is to be executed based on the probability value (operation execution application [0056]).

As per claim 11, Miyoshi et al. teaches the information processing apparatus according to claim 9 (data reception and transmission between units [0037], and a judgment unit to control changeover data [0051]), wherein:

said data for determination is a probability value as a rule deciding condition descriptor included in a data processing request (request packet or code line for description and designation of computers [0077], [0081], [0082]); and

said rule decision processing unit (a control and timer processing unit for carrying out code executing [0022]) is configured to execute random number generation processing, and to execute determining processing for determining whether or not the processing according (See FIG. 2) to a processing request is to be executed (operation execution application [0056]) based on comparison between a generated random

Art Unit: 2146

number (channel number and number generating [0077], [0079], [0087], [0088]) and the probability value (See FIG. 9).

As per claim 12, Miyoshi et al. teaches the information processing apparatus according to claim 9 (data reception and transmission between units [0037], and a judgment unit to control changeover data [0051]), wherein:

said data for determination is data processing request storing data included in a data processing request (request packet or code line for description and designation of computers [0077], [0081], [0082]); and

said rule decision processing unit (judgment unit to control changeover data [0051]), is configured to perform hash value calculation processing (See FIG. 10) based on the data processing request storing data, and to execute determining processing (processing executed, FIG.5 [0046]) for determining whether or not the processing according to a processing request is to be executed (operation execution application [0056]) based on a Comparison (comparator for comparing values [0048], [0053], [0055], [0075]) between a calculated hash value and a setting value set in its own apparatus in advance (See FIG. 8).

As per claim 13, Miyoshi et al. teaches a data recording processing method (recording command operating unit, [0027], and compare and swap method for writing or recording and reproducing data [0079]) for transmitting a data recording processing request (recording unit request command [0029]) to a plurality of nodes connected to a

network (connected to network to carry out communication [0006]), and for executing distributed data recording processing for the plurality of nodes (See FIG.3), by comprising:

- a rule deciding condition setting step (the transmitting method includes steps for data detection [0007]) for setting data to allow a determination of whether the processing according to the processing request is to be executed in a any node of the plurality of nodes that receives the data recording processing request (recording unit request command [0029]);

- a packet generating step (data generating unit [0052]) storing data for determination (temporarily data sorting [0054]) set by the rule deciding condition setting step, and for generating a data recording processing request packet that includes the data (data stored data recording [0050]) for recording processing (See FIG. 5); and

- a packet transmitting step for transmitting the packets generated (data generating unit [0052]) by the packet generating step to each node of the plurality of nodes.

As per claim 15, Miyoshi et al. teaches the data recording processing method according to claim 13 (recording command operating unit, [0027], and compare and swap method for writing or recording and reproducing data [0079]), wherein:

- said data recording processing method (compare and swap method for writing or recording and reproducing data [0079], [0080]) further comprises a data processing unit (a control and timer processing unit for carrying out code executing [0022]) for executing

Art Unit: 2146

FEC encoding processing and interleave processing (See Abstract, FIG. 5); of the data for recording processing (recording unit request command [0029]); and

said packet generating step (data generating unit [0052]) executes generation processing of a packet in which the data processed by the data processing step is set as a payload (payload for data size indication, respective FIGs [0072]).

As per claim 17, Miyoshi et al. teaches a data reproducing processing method for transmitting a data (data transmitting method [0001]) reproducing processing request (reproducing unit request command [0029]) to nodes connected to a network (connected to network to carry out communication [0006]), and for executing data reproducing processing based on return data, comprising:

a rule deciding condition (judgment unit to control changeover data [0051]) setting step for setting data to allow a determination of whether the processing according to the processing request is to be executed (processing executed, FIG.5 [0046]) in a any node of the plurality of nodes node that receives the data reproducing processing request (data reproducing unit [0032]);

a packet generating step (data generating unit [0052]) for storing the data for determination set by the rule deciding condition setting step (judgment unit to control changeover data [0051]), and for generating a data reproducing processing request packet that includes the data for reproducing processing (data storage and data reproducing [0050], FIG. 5); and

a packet transmitting step for transmitting the packets generated by the packet generating step to each node of the plurality of nodes (data transmitting method, and data transmitting packets [005], [006], [0018], [0087]).

As per claim 19, Miyoshi et al. teaches the data reproducing processing method according to claim 17 (data transmitting method [0001], and reproducing unit request command [0029]), further comprising:

a data recovery processing step (data storage and buffer units to recover data [0048]) for executing de-interleave processing and FEC decoding processing (code transactions and synchronization [0086]); wherein

said data recovery processing step executes the de-interleave processing and the FEC decoding processing for data for reproducing processing (a control and timer processing unit for carrying out code executing [0022]) extracted from a packet received from the node that receives the data reproducing processing request (reproducing processing request that start commands to record and reproduce [0029]), and recovers the data (data reproducing unit [0032]).

As per claim 21, Miyoshi et al. teaches a data processing method (recording command operating unit, [0027], and compare and swap method for writing or recording and reproducing data [0079]), for analyzing a data processing request (recording unit request command [0029]) received via a data reception unit (data reception and

Art Unit: 2146

transmission between units [0037]), and for determining whether the data processing request is to be executed (processing executed [0046]), comprising:

- a rule decision processing step for determining whether data processing based on the data processing request is to be executed (See FIG. 5); and

- a data processing step for executing data processing based on the determination of the rule decision processing step (judgment unit to control changeover data [0051]), wherein

- the rule decision processing step determines whether or not the processing according to the processing request is to be executed based on data for determination included (request packet or code line for description and designation of computers [0077]).

As per claim 22, Miyoshi et al. teaches the data processing method according to claim 21 (recording command operating unit, [0027], and compare and swap method for writing or recording and reproducing data [0079]), wherein:

- said data for determination (judgment unit to control changeover data [0051]), is a probability value that is a rule deciding condition descriptor included in the data processing request (request packet or code line for description and designation of computers [0077], [0081], [0082]); and

- said rule decision processing step (See FIG. 2) determines whether or not the processing according to the processing request is to be executed (operation execution application [0056]) in accordance with the probability value (See FIG. 9).

As per claim 23, Miyoshi et al. teaches the data processing method according to claim 21 (recording command operating unit, [0027], and compare and swap method for writing or recording and reproducing data [0079]), wherein:

said data for determination is data processing request (judgment unit to control changeover data [0051]) storing data included in the data processing request (request packet or code line for description and designation of computers [0077], [0081], [0082]); and

said rule decision processing step executes hash value calculation processing (See FIG. 10).based on the data processing request storing data (temporarily data sorting [0054]), and determines whether or not processing according to the processing request is to be executed (operation execution application [0056]) based on a comparison between a calculated hash value and a setting value set in its own apparatus in advance (See FIG. 10).

As per claim 24, Miyoshi et al. teaches the data processing method according to claim 21(recording command operating unit, [0027], and compare and swap method for writing or recording and reproducing data [0079]), wherein:

said data for determination is data processing request storing data included in the data processing request (judgment unit to control changeover data [0051]); and

said rule decision processing step executes hash value calculation processing (See FIG. 10) based on the data processing request storing data (request packet or

code line for description and designation of computers [0077], [0081], [0082]);, and determines whether or not processing according to the processing request is to be executed (operation execution application [0056]) based on a comparison between a calculated hash value and a setting value set in its own apparatus in advance (See FIG.10).

As per claim 25, Miyoshi et al. teaches a computer program (application software of the personal computer [0003]) for transmitting a data recording processing request (data transmitting method [0001], and recording unit request command [0029]) to a plurality of nodes connected to a network (connected to network to carry out communication [0006]) and for executing distributed data recording processing for the plurality of nodes (See FIG.3), comprising:

a rule deciding condition setting step (the transmitting method includes steps for data detection [0007]) for setting data that allows a determination of whether the processing according to the processing request (recording unit request command [0029]) is to be executed in any node of the plurality of nodes that receives the data recording processing request;

a packet generating step (data generating unit [0052]) for storing the data for determination (temporarily data sorting [0054]) set by the rule deciding condition setting step, and for generating a data recording processing request packet that includes the data for recording processing (data stored data recording [0050]); and



a packet transmitting step for transmitting the packets generated by the packet generating step to each node of the plurality of nodes (data generating unit [0052]).

As per claim 26, Miyoshi et al. teaches a computer program (application software of the personal computer [0003]) for transmitting a data reproducing processing request (data transmitting method [0001], and reproducing unit request command [0029]) to a plurality of nodes connected to a network (connected to network to carry out communication [0006]) and for executing data reproducing processing based on return data (See FIG.3), comprising:

a rule deciding condition setting step (the transmitting method includes steps for data detection [0007]) for setting data to allow a determination whether the processing according to the processing request is to be executed in a any node of the plurality of nodes that receives the data recording processing request (recording unit request command [0029]);

a packet generating step (data generating unit [0052]) for storing the data for determination (temporarily data sorting [0054]) set by the rule deciding condition setting step, and for generating a data reproducing processing request packet that stores specifying data for data for reproducing processing (data stored data recording [0050]); and

a packet transmitting step for transmitting the packets generated by the packet generating step to each node of the plurality of nodes (data generating unit [0052]).

As per claim 27, Miyoshi et al. teaches a computer program (application software of the personal computer [0003]) for analyzing a data processing request (unit software [0024], and device driver software for analyzing data [00056]) received via a data reception unit (reception of device I/O control [0022]), and for determining whether the data processing request is to be executed (operation execution application [0056]), by comprising:

- a rule decision processing step (the transmitting method includes steps for data detection [0007]) for determining whether the data processing based on the data processing request is to be executed; and

- a data processing step (See FIG. 1) for executing the data processing based on the determination of the rule decision processing step (judgment unit to control changeover data [0051]), wherein

- the rule decision processing step determines whether or not the processing according to the processing request is to be executed based on data for determination included (request packet or code line for description and designation of computers [0077], [0081], [0082]) in the data processing request received via the data reception unit (reception of device I/O control [0022]).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

Art Unit: 2146

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claim(s) 2, 4, 6, 8, 14, 16, 18, and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miyoshi et al. Pub. (US. No. 2003/0179861 A1) as applied to claim(s) 1, 5,9,13,17,21 respectively above, and further in view of Guha Patent (US. No. 5,699,369).

Miyoshi et al. teaches all of the claimed limitation and further teaches a configuration to execute setting processing and further teaches a description of recording and request processing but does not teach the use of a probability value and assigning 'alpha' and 'beta' to get the processing to execute. However, Guha teaches a probability method that assigns 'alpha' and 'beda' to get the connects services application points and to approximate forward error correction (Col. 21, Line 9). Also teaches a calculation method for configuring and executing processors and further teaches using the blocks to have the outcome but does not teach the relationships between blocks that would be able to be calculated from a returned probability value. Also does not teach the specifics of assigning 'alpha' and 'beda' to get the method calculated. However, Guha teaches a probability method that assigns 'alpha', 'beda' and further teaches the relationships between the assigned values to approximate the forward error correction (Col. 22, Line 15).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Miyoshi et al, by the teaching of Guha.

Because using a probability value 'alpha', 'beta' or any other value to set up a method of calculation and execution 'Forward Error Correction' to processors would be the same idea even though the letters assigned might be different, it would still be an output based on a probability value (Col. 21, Line 20). One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make this modification because Guha further provides the advantage of increasing the reliability of communication in network (Col. 9, Lines 44-49).

### ***Conclusion***

#### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim(s) 23-44 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2146

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action

The examiner requests, in response to this Office action, support should be shown for language added to any original claims on amendment and any new claims. That is, indicate support for newly added claim language by specifically pointing to page(s) and line(s) in the specification and/or drawing figure(s). This will assist the examiner in prosecuting the application.

When responding to this office action, Applicant is advised to clearly point out the patentable novelty which he or she thinks the claims present, in view of the state of the art disclosed by the references cited or the objections made. He or she must also show how the amendments avoid such references or objections See 37 CFR 1.111(c).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdelnabi O. Musa whose telephone number is 571-2701901. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday Thru Friday: 7:30am to 5:00pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jeffrey Pwu can be reached on 571-2726798. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

A.M



JEFFREY PWU  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER